

3-2019

Author's Response to Cherice Bock's and Grace Ji-Sun Kim's Reviews of Reframing the House

Jennifer Buck
Azusa Pacific University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt>



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Buck, Jennifer (2019) "Author's Response to Cherice Bock's and Grace Ji-Sun Kim's Reviews of Reframing the House," *Quaker Religious Thought*: Vol. 132 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol132/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quaker Religious Thought by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

AUTHOR'S RESPONSE TO CHERICE BOCK'S AND GRACE JI-SUN KIM'S REVIEWS OF *REFRAMING THE HOUSE*

JENNIFER BUCK

Thank you for these robust and thoughtful reviews. I am grateful to both Cherice Bock and Grace Ji-Sun Kim for being here and giving time and care towards my work.

I will begin with Cherice Bock's review. In terms of the conversation on the direction of "evangelical" Friends theology, I am grateful for the newly formed Sierra-Cascades Yearly Meeting of Friends. I have been anchored in a belief, years before their Yearly Meeting even emerged, that a true definition of evangelicalism could exist in Friends—centered in Scripture but shedding the baggage of fundamentalism. Sierra Cascades, being Quaker, centered on Jesus, and affirming of communities previously excluded—proves that a possibility can exist, of following Scripture closely and the Friends tradition heartily while also containing a much broader definition of salvation, sin and ecclesiology. I recognize that even for this community to exist caused deep pain and hardship to both Sierra Cascades Yearly Meeting and the Northwest Yearly Meeting of Friends from which it emerged; however, the seed of hope in such a difficult season comes from the possibility of a renewed, and I would argue a truer, idea of evangelical Friends theology existing within Quakerism today.

In regards to a definition of the term "evangelical," I imagine Bock is right—that many would not put this work in the camp of evangelicalism, but I will keep fighting for a broader definition! I believe this understanding really is a truer definition to Bebbington's four components of evangelicalism—stressing Christ's work on the cross, the role of Scripture, an active and expressive faith, and salvation through conversion—and not, in fact, a political ideology entrenched in homophobia, misogyny, xenophobia and the like, all in the name of Jesus.¹ I could not bring myself to use many contemporary examples of "evangelicals," especially in the political or public sphere, because my Christian faith compels me beyond partisan politics and shaming individuals by name. And like Cherice Bock identified, I am not sure this work would be heard by them either. Even to include the

context, methodology and lens of “evangelical” was a battle I had at length with Anselm Min, but Rosemary Ruether encouraged me to continue voicing this perspective even if it is not considered by most. My definition of evangelical may never be the primary demographic of the term “evangelical,” and yet I will still uphold the term. I am grateful for the collection of essays that has come out since this work, entitled “*Still Evangelical?*” by some folks like Soong-Chan Rah, Lisa Sharon Harper, and others, where the political and social as well as the theological meanings of the term are considered.² I think there is still work to be done in separating evangelicalism from the religious right and its cultural baggage, and what I would define as fundamentalism, but I believe that important work must continue to be done by the church.

Now to speak to Grace Ji-Sun Kim’s review, I do desire that Quakerism continue to evolve, and find its distinctives of equality and peace evolving alongside movements like liberation theology and global feminist theology. I am grateful that she shares this vision with me, even though her own denominational context is not Quaker. I appreciated Grace Ji-Sun Kim’s proposal of including a practical guide or step by step at the end of the book on how to live in and out of the intercultural churches. I think that fantastic idea would continue to help older Quaker churches evolve and better become intercultural and intersectional communities of Quakers. How American churches can become multi-ethnic is a tremendous struggle, and one that I continue to engage in writings since *Reframing the House*, as well as with my students.

Grace Kim’s broader critique of power and powerful voices is one I could not agree with more. Though limited in scope for this work, I think this is the work of theology, and Grace your intersectional theology is continuing to guide the global church in this work. I felt that I could only do justice to a few voices, and did have to limit my selections for this work. I selected particular voices based on particularized guidelines from my Ph.D. dissertation committee, but admittedly I was attempting to work within the confines of tradition in a manner which would be viewed as credible, which has been far too male for too long.

In terms of the number of male voices in the section on historical ecclesiology, I was still working within the tradition of “evangelical ecclesiology,” which I am sad to say, has historically been far too male. The same being true in the methodology chapter, when using the

voices I did it was because of their robust writings on ecclesiology. I struggled to find anything in the category of “evangelical” and “feminist” and “ecclesiology,” particularly historically in terms of lengthy writing on the subject, and that is much of the injustice I am attempting to work against in this book by writing about those voices today.

Concerning the conversation of hybridity, scholars now living in the US like Kwok Pui-Lan and Maria Pilar Aquino better voice that and I agree with Grace Ji-Sun Kim that such a conversation would be a fascinating expansion upon this project. Rosemary Ruether, my advisor for this project, and I narrowed to three feminist scholars who have written extensively on ecclesiology since that was what I wanted to focus on, from representative regions of the world, but Kim’s suggestions of other, lesser-known names excites me in how these voices are growing! Though their writings on ecclesiology may be limited, their social location would add depth and perspective to a global ecclesiology. I believe that considering subaltern voices would be a fantastic direction for global theology and global ecclesiology to continue to grow. May their work continue to be read and published, may they continue to teach the broader church. I heard a great recent lecture at my university by Miguel De La Torre about hybridity and exile in particular, the idea of homelessness that immigrant Christians forever feel. I believe this is a dimension for global ecclesiology to continue to develop, especially as issues of asylum and immigration continue in the US and must be a concern for our churches.

Thank you to the Quaker Theological Discussion Group for giving time to this book. I am honored that my first publication would receive this attention from you, and I am grateful for this community of scholars. Only a few years ago, I was a young, nervous graduate student in these meetings, now I have an upcoming book with Barclay Press, forthcoming in 2019, on Quakerism and practical theology, and I look forward to sharing its ideas with the Quaker Theological Discussion Group at future American Academy of Religion meetings.

ENDNOTES

1. David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. (London: Routledge, 1989).
2. Mark Labberton, ed. *Still Evangelical? Insiders Reconsider Political, Social and Theological Meaning*. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2018).